

HST 203: U.S. History Sp19 (Escobar)

[Home](#) / [My courses](#) / [HST 203 Sp19 \(Escobar Meta 44706 47037\)](#) / [Week 4](#) / [Forum 2](#) / [The Role of the U.S. in the World](#)

?

Search forums

Forum 2

The Role of the U.S. in the World

 [Subscribe](#)

[◀ Taxation](#) [The Role of the U.S. in the World ▶](#)

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

Move

Pin



The Role of the U.S. in the World
by [Joe Escobar](#) - Friday, April 19, 2019, 11:49 AM

This thread is for discussions on the The Role of the U.S. in the World topic.

To make your POSTS, click the reply link in this, MY post. To reply to another student's post, be sure to click the reply link within in THEIR post.

IMPORTANT - SUBJECT LINES

BE SURE to use an informative subject line for your post, which clearly describes the part number, the source, or the questions you are addressing. Do NOT simply leave it RE: The Role of the U.S. in the World

Sum of ratings: [_-](#) [Permalink](#) | [Edit](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Similarities between Wilson and Obama
by [Matthew Berry](#) - Monday, April 22, 2019, 12:32 PM

If you look at President Obama’s Presidency and even his time in the Senate, I would say there are huge similarities between Woodrow Wilson’s Presidency or “Wilsonianism”. For one example on “Foreign Affairs” just as President Wilson tried to play it neutral between “The Triple Entente” and “The Alliance”, even going on his campaign for re-election running on the campaign slogan “He kept us out of war”. Obama ran on similar campaign promises to end the Iraq war. Just as Wilson was opposed to entry in WWI, President Obama was in opposition to the Iraq war, and pushed to keep us from invading Iraq. Throughout Wilsons Presidency, he did try to push diplomacy with the European nations calling for “peace without victory” (textbook ch. 23 page 745). President Wilson, was also concerned once at war that the American people will “forget there ever was such a thing as tolerance. To fight you must be brutal and ruthless, and the spirit of ruthless brutality will enter into the very fiber of our national life” (textbook ch.23 page 752).

We saw similarities with President Obama and his views on the Iraq war prior to being elected as President, and then how he was forced to change his position later on once elected. On Oct. 2, 2002 while still a Senator, Obama said at an anti-war rally:

“I know that even a successful war against Iraq will require a US occupation of undetermined length, at undetermined cost, with undetermined consequences. I know that an invasion of Iraq without a clear rationale and without strong international support will only fan the flames of the Middle East, and encourage the worst, rather than best, impulses of the Arab world, and strengthen the recruitment arm of Al Qaeda. I am not opposed to all wars. I’m opposed to dumb wars.” (Washington Post, Jaime Fuller-How Obama talked aboutIraq, from2002-2014).

But just as Wilson’s neutral stance in the beginning of WWI, changed and brought the United States in to the war in 1917. So did Obama’s stance with the Iraq war, in when he stated on [Nov. 21, 2006](#): "[My plan] includes opening a dialogue with both Syria and Iran, an idea supported by both James Baker and the incoming secretary of defense, Robert Gates. We know these countries, Iran and Syria, want us to fail, and we should remain steadfast in our opposition to their support of terrorism and Iran's nuclear ambitions. But neither Iran nor Syria want to see a security vacuum in Iraq filled with chaos, terrorism, refugees, and violence, as it could have a destabilizing effect on the entire region and within Iran and Syria themselves."

It was President Obama’s hope just like Wilsons that he would be able to use an open dialogue to pursue an end to the war. The reality was that there was going to be no diplomacy with anyone in the middle-east at this time. President Obama went on to say:

[Dec. 10, 2009](#): "We must begin by acknowledging the hard truth: We will not eradicate violent conflict in our lifetimes. There will be times when nations -- acting individually or in concert -- will find the use of force not only necessary but morally justified."

[Aug. 3, 2010](#): "The hard truth is we have not seen the end of American sacrifice in Iraq. But make no mistake: Our commitment in Iraq is changing -- from a military effort led by our troops to a civilian effort led by our diplomats." (Washington Post, Jaime Fuller- How Obama talked about Iraq, from 2002-2014).

Although There are many similarities between Wilson and Obama, there are some differences as well... Wilson did not inherit a war, he joined one (as brought out in chapter 23 page 752) “the world must be made safe for democracy”. Obama inherited the Iraq war, that had begun with the Bush Presidency after the 9/11. I don’t think that President Wilson’s views of internationalism would be better received these days, I think that the class “Foreign Policy Poll” (see Foreign Policy Poll in Moodle) shows that the majority of the class falls into the “Mild” group of Reservationists then again at the time of this post over 50% have not done the poll so it is hard to say. I personally think that America has become less Internationalist and isn’t focused so much on a “greater political or economic cooperation among nations and people”. Our current President, President Trump is more focused on security of our nation, and our economy. Although it seems like he would like to have better economic cooperation among other nations I don’t think he is interested in them benefiting from America’s past deals.

Sum of ratings:[3 \(1\)](#)

3

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: The Role of the U.S. in the World

by [Daniel Zavala](#) - Monday, April 22, 2019, 5:26 PM

Considering the information provided, I would consider myself to occupy a space somewhere between a mild reservationist and a strong reservationist. While I can certainly agree that the presence of an international committee dedicated to keeping peace is a good thing to have, I would also not want that same committee to have the ability to be able to directly interfere with the sovereignty of the united states (or any country for that matter.)

If I had been an advisor to Wilson I would have strongly advised for him to alter the treaty to reduce the authority it held over America. This would have helped to make the treaty more appealing to Reservationists. Although in truth, according to the book (Liberty, Equality, Power. Page 766) He would have likely faced considerable opposition simply due to party politics (many republicans like Henry Cabot wanted to humiliate Wilson and opposed him for that reason alone.)

Sum of ratings:[2 \(1\)](#)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



league of nations & 14 points

by [Trenton Hough](#) - Monday, April 22, 2019, 8:26 PM

Reading about the league of nations and watching the video about Woodrow Wilison’s trip to Europe has me agreeing with Henry Cabot Lodge, that Wilson should not have pushed the league of nations so hard. When Wilson set sail on the voyage across the Atlantic Ocean, he took his idea of world peace, the 14 points, with him. (Wilson at Versailles video) He was very determined the other countries would adhere to the points with out to much compromise for the sake of world peace. If I was alive and a member of Wilsons advise team, I would have agreed with secretary of state Robert lancing and Colonel House (Wilson at Versailles video) and told him not to make the trip as it would be a waste of time. I think that House and lancing could see what was coming. Countries that were at war are on a very short leash and are only looking for what’s best for them and their people. Wilson was so sure

on the fact that he was an Instrument of God (Wilson at Versailles video) and could change the world he didn't look at the reality of his plan. A Wikipedia article named 14 points explained how Woodrow Wilson wanted to take land and territories away from certain countries and give it back to others. The article also explained how Woodrow Wilson wanted absolute freedom of navigation up on the seas. I believe Woodrow Wilson's 14 points failed because the demands he was asking were too much from each country. I believe Wilson had the right idea going into the meeting with the leaders, but with asking too much too soon. I also disagree with Wilson's League of Nations. Again, this was another point that had the right idea but wasn't realistic. There is no way to completely stop two countries from wanting to go to war with each other. The League of Nations was set up to stop war through peaceful negotiations between two countries(www.cs.mcgill.ca). Just like any other treaty there would always be a country that would go against the treaty and still declare war on another country. Henry Cabot lodge opposed the League of Nations for a few reasons. The first was Woodrow Wilson left him another Republicans out of the discussion of the 14 points. He also did not want to change the way that America Dealt with international business. I think America needed a change in foreign business, but the League of Nations was not the right way to do it. We see that the League of Nations fails because WW2 happens a few short years later.

Sum of ratings:[2](#) (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



The Role of the U.S. in the World

by [Aaron Richards](#) - Monday, April 22, 2019, 9:14 PM

I agree with Lodge that while we may want to involve ourselves in international politics we need to protect our own interests. As a country we still have a fair amount of issues rooted in civil rights and wealth distribution. However we are way more focused on going to war in other countries to help them with the same issues? Ok, let's think of the countries of the world as people. We are helping others with their mental illnesses and issues while ignoring our own. It is a good thing to help people from other countries but how can we do that in good conscience while ignoring people in the same communities as us?

Sum of ratings:[0](#) (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Role of the United States

by [Maclain O'Leary](#) - Monday, April 22, 2019, 10:14 PM

Before this forum, I considered myself a reservationist. I do not believe we as a country should overstep and get entangled in the problems of other countries. And while that view point hasn't entirely changed, I do beleive I see the view point of Internationalists a little more clearly. World War one for example. Woodrow Wilson felt it was very important for us to stay out of the war for as long as possible. We didn't have a personal vendetta in the war, therefore to get involved in the war would be to risk American lives where it wasn't needed. Furthermore, by staying out, America boomed economically. I believe as far as foreign affairs and policy, this is a Reservationist way of thinking. But eventually we couldn't stay out of it anymore. Germans began to bomb our ships and foreign countries were running out of money, so they could no longer pay us. I believe that if Wilsons ideas of Internationalism were set in today, there would be a pretty even gap of people believing he is right and he is wrong. Our current president is of the mindset "America First", or todays version of American Exceptionalism. This means that he believes our country needs to be put first in all aspects of government operation. While this may not be a great parallel, the Mexican border wall is a good example. Trump suggests the wall as a means to keep American economy safe by limiting immigration. Many people oppose this idea, but as much as we don't see it, many people agree as well. The only reason I use this example is because it shows how divided we are even today on how to handle foreign issues.

Sum of ratings:[2](#) (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Non-intervention as a foreign policy

by [Trenton Hough](#) - Tuesday, April 23, 2019, 5:58 PM

The 3 Videos about non-intervention as a foreign policy with Ron Paul, Alan Keyser, and John McCain have me a little confused on what I truly believe. All 3 men make great points in their speech for why we should or shouldn't get involved with other country's affairs. In the 3rd video with John McCain, a Vietnam veteran, he explains how not anything doing will lead to negative violence in the world. McCain uses the example of Hitler coming to power in WWI as a point that we didn't intervene, and the outcome was horrible. I believe McCain is right about how the US is such strong influence on the world that if we don't do anything some countries and people would fall apart. In the 2nd video Paul states "We should direct our attention only to national security and not get involved for these feel good reasons...". I believe this statement that Paul said is what the USA should live by today. We have enough

problems at home that sending food and money to poor countries should not be our top priority. The US does have the responsibility to keep it citizens safe. If this means having troops in Germany Afghanistan and other countries around the world, we need to do it, but only for our safety. We need to stop acting like the over protective mom and let countries figure their problems out by themselves.

Sum of ratings:[1 \(1\)](#)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Internationalist Isolationist Spectrum & Henry Lodge
by [Cameron Lindsey](#) - Wednesday, April 24, 2019, 2:10 PM

Part 1

Like many issues and political stances: I see both sides of this argument about whether we should have been involved in the League of Nations or not. On one hand, like strong reservationists, I feel we should always reserve the right increase our armaments whenever threatened with invasion or going to war. On the other hand: I feel its good to maintain close, tight-knit relationships with other countries in the name of peace. If this had gone through, it would have been nice to know that we had four other countries at our side at all times. America tends to do what it wants *when* it wants however, and I'm not surprised this never got ratified by congress as the instructor pointed out last class. If I were an advisor of President Wilson, I would have told him to just keep it to 13 points, and forget about the league.

In the book it says, "Wilson believed that the league would redeem the failures of the Paris Peace Conference. Under its auspices, free trade and freedom of the seas would be achieved, reparations against Germany would be reduced or eliminated, disarmament of the Allies would proceed, and the principle of self-determination would be extended to the peoples outside Europe." ----- I think Wilson's heart was in the right place; (and let's remember: he never wanted to be in this war in the first place) but this was just a tad unrealistic. Knowing he'd have to face a republican senate including Lodge, and millions of *proud-to-be-American* Americans, this was a pipe dream. We'd just won a war, and were owed many favors. Our economy was dominating. Why climb into bed with European nations?

In hindsight, it's hard for me to say what I think we should have done at the time. What I do know is that I disagree with the statement from the article that says "In the future, let's hope that Mr. Bush retains Lodge's conviction that the use of force must always be on behalf of justice and freedom." (Thomas Flemming, *So Henry Cabot Lodge Was One of History's Villains?*) "Peace" and "force" don't belong in the same sentence.

Sum of ratings:[2 \(1\)](#)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Isolation
by [Kaleah Holmes](#) - Wednesday, April 24, 2019, 5:12 PM

I felt that the first video (Ron Paul Interview) made a very good point. Since we have troops in other countries so often the United States is going broke. That is one very good reason to pull back, doing this will help the economy for us. Instead of paying for troops to be elsewhere we could use that money to do things to improve our country. On that note I do not think we should "turn our backs on other countries" (from Alan Keyes on Darfur video). It is not fair when a country is invading another country through extreme violence someone should stand up for them. I do not think we need to be that country every time.

Sum of ratings:[1 \(1\)](#)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Isolation
by [Anna McNutt](#) - Friday, April 26, 2019, 10:39 PM

I think it's interesting that the mindset that we, as the US, need to help other people is still very present. I think overall this is a good trait to have, but as a country there has to be a line drawn. There is a time and a place that we, as a powerful nation, should step in. In the same video with Alan Keyes he stated: "We should direct our attention only to national security and not get involved for these feel good reasons..." (Keyes video :25) Knowing that he is talking about a genocide in Africa that has been going on for about 16 years, I disagree with his

statement. In this example (without knowing a lot about it) my first response is that we should help. However, without the context I think he has a good point. Our priority should be our own county and our own safety. I don't think we should involve ourselves in conflict if it is not necessary. I agree that we should help other countries, because we have the power to do so, but like you said I don't think we always have to be the one to help.

Sum of ratings:[1\(1\)](#)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Isolation
by [Brayden Lane](#) - Saturday, April 27, 2019, 8:44 PM

I agree a lot that as a nation we still have the present mid set but there has to be a point in time where we say enough and not go further into war or debt. The quote you choose is good in a way that it shows the points your trying to make and shows the entirety of your post. A question I have for you is when do you think the line should be crossed. At what point do you feel we shouldn't intervene because we wont be wanted there or it will in return hurt us. To me the line between not intervening for feel good or joining because its morally right is very fine and a tricky line to maneuver. I agree it should be our country first over others, but since out country has one of the if not the strongest military in the world at what point should we show dominance and our presence.

Sum of ratings:[1\(1\)](#)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Isolation
by [Anna McNutt](#) - Saturday, April 27, 2019, 10:56 PM

That's a good question, and a hard one as well. I agree that the line between intervening to feel good and joining because we should is tough to distinguish. Personally I don't think that we should get involved in a situation where we are not "invited." It seems that we try to stop some situations because **we think** its wrong. And it may very well be wrong, but any county that is not ours, is not ours to control.

In the video with John McCain, Ron Paul said "I don't want to send our troops over seas using force to tell them how to live" (McCain debate video 1:30) I think this is the best way to describe how I feel. Because in the end who are we to say whats right or wrong. We may be powerful but that doesn't give us the power to change people. It doesn't give us the right to determine what another country should do or how they should live.

Of course there are times that we may have to get involved. We may have to stand up for an ally or protect innocent people. Like I said before, there's a time and a place. I just don't think we should get involved unless its absolutely necessary.

Sum of ratings:[1\(1\)](#)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Troubled foreign policy
by [Cristian Alamo](#) - Wednesday, April 24, 2019, 7:11 PM

The treaty of versailles and Wilson's fourteen points had the right idea but poor execution. The creation of the league of nations in point fourteen of Wilson's plan was a good idea per say but of course it had some big flaws on the United States' end. The first and most fatal flaw was the fact that if the United States went to war, congress wouldn't decide if it went to war, the league of nations would which goes against the constitution . Also the treaty of versailles bankrupting and putting all the blame on Germany was also a flaw in the treaty. Germany's depression in the years following WWI lead to the rise of the Nazi party and the third reich which caused another devastating war and loss of millions and millions more lives. If I was advising President Wilson, I would suggest this; number one would be to create a an alliance more resembling modern UN and number two do not put all the blame on Germany. Because Germany is a trade partner with US and also it would prevent another world war.

The war on Afghanistan and the middle east presence can draw many similarities of 1918-1920. The United States was attacked (9/11) and the United States went to a costly war that dragged on . During the time of the Afghan war Bush appeared very Wilsonian (Video on Bush) The United States still has troops in the middle east to this day to enforce the United States. I also look at the ongoing war on drugs and while yes it was for the people of the United States, the US caused violence to rise in many foreign countries and intervened in many countries . We as a country have done so much damage to the middle east that all the good that was done can be overlooked by the negatives.

I believe Wilson's ideas would actually be more poorly received to this day by Reservationists and Irreconcilables because as of recent there has been more calls to focus on internal affairs as a country. The war on Afghanistan by many is considered a failure and the United States seems more focused on creating jobs and fixing problems within. President Trump, I believe, was not elected by Republicans to fix all the United States' problems with foreign affairs, he was elected to fix problems at home. Swing states that had many centrist blue collared workers voted to elect Trump because of his promises to fix what is at home.

I agree much more with Senator. Keyes than Ron Paul. Ron Paul's isolationist strategy is a very dangerous precedent. A regime over seas could rise to power and attack our home but I believe Keyes idea of assessing the situation and if we deem the threat big enough to go to war we should engage. But the problem lies in what does the United States deem a big enough threat to go to war. Keyes ideas reflect mine more but not exactly. I would've pulled the soldiers out of Iraq but not throughout the entire world. Keyes most reflects Woodrow Wilson I believe and how Wilson wanted to stay out of WWI until it was deemed a threat to United States sovereignty . Wilson promised American's at the beginning of WWI that it was Europe's war (book pg.748) and stayed out until it was deemed a threat.

Sum of ratings:[3 \(1\)](#)

3

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Wilson v. Lodge
by [Amanda Francis](#) - Wednesday, April 24, 2019, 9:18 PM

According to the [foreign policy opinion poll](#), most people chose "mild Reservationist". Professor Escobar noted in class that this could just have been the safest one to pick, but if not, then it somewhat lines up with the Reservationist majority of 1918. Personally, I chose "limited Internationalist". I originally thought Wilson's idea of the League of Nations sounded like a great idea that every senator should have backed 100%, but after reading the chapter and some of the forum materials, I can now see the flaws that the Republicans had with it. The article about Henry Cabot Lodge explained the League of Nations conflict in a way that matches up with my foreign policy vote more than I thought. "Succeeding generations of voters and politicians have backed Henry Cabot Lodge, not Woodrow Wilson, in affirming an international commitment but retaining control of America's sovereignty." International involvement is integral but not at the country's expense which means the freedom to fight or not to fight a war. It was also interesting when the article stated, "Lodge's vision of an America that is prepared to work with the international organizations such as the World Bank and the United Nations but retains the freedom to act independently when necessary." In regard to the League of Nations, I think the biggest disappointment is that with Wilson's declining health, he was unwilling to make any amendments or negotiations to the treaty. If only Wilson and Lodge could have worked together and seen that maybe they agreed more on foreign policy that they thought- both leaning on the side of Internationalist. According to our textbook, some "people believe that flawed treaty and failure of the League contributed to Adolf Hitler's rise in Germany" (textbook 768).

Sum of ratings:[2 \(1\)](#)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Isolationist versus internationalist.
by [Brayden Lane](#) - Wednesday, April 24, 2019, 11:14 PM

Ron Paul gave reasons why we should be isolationists including having no constitutional or moral authority. He wants to bring the troops home. Differently Alan Keyes a republican from Maryland stated how he was appalled by that thought of coming home. He stated "if somebody in the world gets hurt somewhere in the world, someone in America grieves for them." Another quote given by John McCain states "that kind of isolationism is what caused world war 2." Senator McCain is talking about senator Carson Paul in which he believes that the war in Iraq has failed and its time to bring the troops home. McCain also goes on to say how the troops say "Let us win this war". Specifically these three quotes make me lean more towards being a internationalists, partly in which I believe to have a better and safer home you need to have an internationalist country in order to have strong isolationism. In order to be able to trade with others or sell goods to other countries we need to be internationalists to have a better economy as well.

Sum of ratings:

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Wilson's ideas today

by [Anna McNutt](#) - Thursday, April 25, 2019, 7:31 PM

According to the class poll the majority of the class falls toward the internationalist side when it comes to foreign policy. That is when you take out the major chunk of us that fall in the middle of the spectrum. The results of this small survey are the opposite of how most Americans felt in 1918. During this time, Woodrow Wilson’s internationalist ideas were not favored, however I think that these ideas would be more supported today. Wilson tried to get the US to be in the League of Nations, and as we know this didn’t end up happening. This makes sense, given the more Reservationist ideals during the time. Today however, we are in a similar “League,” the United Nations. These groups are not exactly the same, but they are very similar overall. I believe that Wilson's idea of the League of Nations would be accepted today, at least more that it was during his time.

When I learned that Wilson failed to get the US to join the League of Nations, or sign the Treaty of Versailles, I questioned his success as a president. As we were told in the forum material that idea “would be wrong.” He did accomplish things and his name and his story still lives on. Maybe he could not accomplish everything he had hoped during his time as president, but in a way he is, even after his death, still accomplishing things with his foundation and the Wilson Center. Like I said, today his ideas seem to be accepted.

Sum of ratings:

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Wilson's ideas today

by [Nicolette D Erazo](#) - Saturday, April 27, 2019, 10:15 PM

You stated, “According to the class poll, the majority of the class falls toward the internationalist side when it comes to foreign policy.” From looking at the data, it appears that the majority falls under “mild reservationists”, so to say the majority is another group could lead to some misunderstanding. Because such a large percentage is in the middle of the spectrum, this indicates that the people of today would potentially be in a position among the grey area, regarding the support of Wilson’s actions, rather than the eagerness for foreign engagement of the far internationalist side.

Sum of ratings:

0

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Wilson's ideas today

by [Anna McNutt](#) - Saturday, April 27, 2019, 11:05 PM

I understand the confusion. I just meant that when it comes to a side (internationalist or reservationist) our class does lean more toward the internationalist side of the spectrum. I also did say "That is when you take out the major chunk of us that fall in the middle of the spectrum." My general point was to say that overall, it seems that we are more internationalist leaning than we were when Wilson was president.

Sorry for the confusion!

Sum of ratings:

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Ron Paul Isolationist?

by [Amanda Francis](#) - Friday, April 26, 2019, 2:40 PM

After watching both videos with Ron Paul, I disagree with him in the first video and agree with him in the second video which further proves to me that foreign policy is extremely complicated. I also think that Ron Paul’s views on war and foreign affairs line up with Woodrow Wilson’s stance in the beginning of WWI which was to not get involved or remain neutral. In the second video, Paul states that there is a difference between “non-intervention” and isolationism. He continues on to say that he’s not an isolationist and he believes in American involvement in foreign trade and communication but not getting involved in war (video 1:32). I agree with Paul in theory just like I agreed with Wilson’s neutrality in the beginning of the war, but as we saw then, it’s not always that simple. “The entry of the United States into the war gave the Allies the muscle they needed to defeat the Central Powers” (textbook 752). In the first video, Paul’s stance on U.S. involvement in aiding Darfur sounds more like isolationism. He states, “We

should direct our attention only to national security and not getting involved for these ‘feel good reasons” saying that any involvement leads to some kind of war (video 0:25). This I don’t agree with, and it contradicts what Paul said in the other video about not being an isolationist.

Sum of ratings:[2](#) 2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



International Affairs Interpretation
by [Nicolette D Erazo](#) - Friday, April 26, 2019, 10:23 PM

When reading through each stance on international affairs, it seems the the strong internationalists had a very extreme passion and belief that it was their duty to insert themselves into international affairs. "The League of Nations has come about by no plan of our conceiving, but by the hand of God who led us into this way. We cannot turn back. We can only go forward, with lifted eyes and freshened spirit, to follow the vision. It was of this that we dreamed at our birth." (Strong Internationalists) The way this statement is worded holds a great deal of intensity. Then on the other end of the spectrum the irreconcilables show a clear disinterest in these ideas. "Shall we go to the League to help make decisions, and then if we think that decision works for peace, join with our allies, but in case it works for war, withdraw our cooperation?" (Ireconcilables) Seeing both far ends has not shaken my personal opinions of being placed in the middle of the spectrum because to tread with caution seems more logical than to be driven only with passionate feelings or reserved with no plans of changing intent.

Sum of ratings:[1](#) 1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Our role in the world
by [Brayden Lane](#) - Friday, April 26, 2019, 11:44 PM

Watching the interview with Ron Paul he makes it clear that he is an isolationist and not an internationalist. He is asked if we should be involved or should have stayed out of certain wars. He said we should have only gotten in World War 2 because of pearl harbor and retaliate for 9/11 but not remain there. "Our job isn't to make them better people but us better people." As an American its what you want to hear and believe, but to me making the U.S a better country you have to be able to have a presence in the world and make sure people want and will trade with you. The best point I see made however is when Ron Paul said "Well how would you feel if china came here guns raised to protect there oil." To me that's a great point because not just oil in general but overall we wont be very much appreciated around the world and no one would want to do business or trade with us. On the flip side of that the argument would be if the U.S was under attack by another country or going through an internal genocide, we would want help from other countries'. On the scale between internationalist and isolationist I still remain the same and believe in internationalism.

Sum of ratings:[1](#) 1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Reservationist vs. Internationalist
by [David Pineda](#) - Saturday, April 27, 2019, 8:31 PM

After reading the definitions of the different positions the could have been held and the way the terminology was used it has greatly affected my view of my placement on the spectrum. I labeled myself as an internationalist on the spectrum pole but these definitions make me doubt what my position would have been in the past. I do see myself as someone to take criticism and be able to adapt and alter plans to be the best for everyone. However after seeing how Woodrow Wilson was completely unwilling to change his position and take even the small amount of criticism people may have had on his treaty. And finally after reading the article that was given in the forum I do see myself siding with Henry Lodge that we should've intervened earlier and held a greater presence in the world before to perhaps end the war faster. I don't see Woodrow Wilson as a "Strong internationalist" I see him as being stubborn and close minded because he used god to cloud his vision and make him believe he was doing the right thing instead of listening to the criticism he was given and change. I see Henry lodge as an open mined Internationalist who wanted the best for everyone.

The only advice I could give Woodrow Wilson was to listening to what others had to say and work with them, not against him. his firm stand on ratifying the treat how it was only further distanced him from those that were in control of the senate and would end in nothing getting done. Which is all that ended up happening for Wilson.

Sum of ratings:[2](#) 2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Wilsonian ideas

by [David Pineda](#) - Saturday, April 27, 2019, 8:43 PM

Looking at the foreign policy poll that was filled out by our classmates, even today the largest categories are mild reservationists. Although I do think the views of both extreme sides of the spectrum have changed. I don't think that strong internationalists are driven by god to do what they believe is right. And I don't believe that irreconcilables are completely against having representatives talk to other nations. I do think Wilson's ideas would have been accepted just a little easier now than back then before. However, strong reservationists wouldn't completely agree with everything he has to say. I do think that they would be more willing to talk all with him about the topic.

I do not see myself in the largest group, I put myself with the limited internationalists ideology.

Sum of ratings: [0 \(1\)](#)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Interesting times we live in

by [Matthew Berry](#) - Saturday, April 27, 2019, 8:56 PM

I just thought I would share this, I found it very interesting based on the topics we have been studying as well as this week's Forum. I think it will be very interesting to see how the US responds to the disregard of the Monroe Doctrine, by Russia, China, & Iran. I will tell you that I answered the in-class Forum Poll as a Mild Reservationist, this was a very hard choice for me. On one hand, I support our troops, and will respect whatever decisions that our President, Congress, Senate, & Military Leadership need to make to stabilize the world and keep our country and allies safe. But, I think there needs to really be a little more focus on our issues at home rather than abroad. I have been all over the world and fought a lot of fights, and it kills me to see that we have cities here in the United States that have serious issues like failed healthcare, education, homelessness, starvation, drug addiction, violence the same issues as some of the 3rd world countries I have been sent to serve in; and I have seen the billions of dollars that our country's (the taxpayer's) money has spent to go to these countries, yet we can't take care of our own country properly. On the other hand, I personally understand that there is a need at times for the United States to step in on occasion to protect the freedoms and safety of others, but at this point in time if people don't want to make things better for their own countries than we have zero business risking our lives for something that they won't even value and apparently don't really want that being... Freedom!!! We should leave these countries up to what I call the "Natural Selection Scenario". If they don't want to get on board, to make things better than let them destroy themselves. If other countries want to slaughter one another go ahead! Continue to trade your daughters for goats, live your lives under tyrannical leadership, have zero quality of life, no rights, that's their choice. Anyhow, I saw this article in News Week and I really think that it is something everyone should be informed about. And again it will be interesting to see how the main stream media, the crazy rhetoric, and the propaganda that will be sure to follow will form people's ideas on how we should react to this situation.

"Russia and China have condemned recent U.S. moves in Latin America, where they accuse President Donald Trump's administration of warmongering and interfering in the affairs of sovereign countries.

As the U.S. stepped up efforts to oust Venezuelan President Nicolás Maduro in favor of political challenger and parliament speaker Juan Guaidó, U.S. Southern Command chief Navy Admiral Craig Faller told *Foreign Policy* last week that defense officials "are on the balls of our feet" in anticipation of taking action. Russian Foreign Ministry spokesperson Maria Zakharova responded Thursday to these remarks, saying this "reaffirms our fears that U.S. military action in Venezuela is not an abstraction, but a possible reality that is admitted in Washington."

"Another pseudo-reason for getting ready for a military invasion is the need to contain Russian influence in Venezuela," Zakharova told reporters, referring to recent reports that the U.S. had held high-level meetings considering the use of force against the crisis-stricken socialist-led state.

"Once again I would like to repeat: all Russian actions on Venezuelan territory are consistent with the legal government of the Bolivarian Republic," she added, recalling U.S. invasions of countries [such as Yugoslavia and Iraq](#). "Apparently, the U.S. military is really considering the possibility of repeating this sad experience—to start bombing civilian structures and people, who are guilty only of supporting the legitimate president of their country that does not like Washington."

Russia, which has sent up to 100 military personnel to fulfill "military-technical cooperation" with Venezuela, has warned that, after Venezuela, fellow leftist-led Cuba and Nicaragua would be next on the U.S. hit list. These three countries have been referred to as a "troika of tyranny" by White House national security adviser John Bolton, who previously added Cuba—along with Libya and Syria—to former President George W. Bush's "axis of evil" comprised of Iran, Iraq and North Korea in 2002.

In addition to cracking down on Venezuela via sanctions that have exacerbated an economic crisis also attributed to internal mismanagement, the U.S. announced new restrictions Wednesday intended to limit the flow of U.S. and foreign capital to Cuba. Bolton again invoked the Monroe Doctrine, a 19th-century policy designed to kick European powers out of Latin America and later repurposed to suppress the rise of left-wing movements across the region, arguing "we must all reject the forces of communism and socialism in this hemisphere."

The U.S. has been tied to past attempts to overthrow the governments of the so-called "troika of tyranny" as well as many other leaders across the Western Hemisphere. Zakharova said Thursday that, "regardless of whether it is Cuba, Venezuela or any other country in the world, unilateral sanctions are illegitimate."

Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesperson Lu Kang took a similar stance, telling a press briefing Thursday that Beijing "opposes such wrong practices as unilateral sanctions and long-arm jurisdiction based on domestic laws outside the U.N. Security Council." He said that "China believes that mutual respect, equality, peaceful co-existence and win-win cooperation should serve as the guidance" for international relations.

China too has sent a delegation carrying humanitarian assistance to Venezuela. Iran [has as well](#), via the privately-owned Mahan Air sanctioned by the U.S. over allegations it was used to transport personnel and equipment for the elite Revolutionary Guards that the U.S. recently designated a terrorist organization. – (Newsweek byTOM O’CONNOR ON 4/18/19)

Sum of ratings:[2](#) (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Reservationist or Isolationist

by [Maximillian Prentice](#) - Saturday, April 27, 2019, 9:17 PM

Part 1:

As far as my position on the internationalist spectrum, I stick with my response of mild reservationist. President Wilson pushed for a more integrated and unified world, including the United States. While I think his heart was in a good place, I also feel like he was set on things being the way he wanted them to be. In the video Wilson at Versailles, the Historian Walter LaFeber mentions that Wilson thought of himself as, “an instrument of God”; another historian mentions that Wilson wanted to be known as a “revolutionary of peace” (1:00 – 1:45, Versailles video). If I had advice for Wilson, I might just recommend toning down his vision of restructuring how the world works and focus on maintaining peace. And though some of Wilson’s ideals may have been a little too extreme for the time period, I do agree with some Wilsonianist principles, especially the idea of self-determination.

Part 2:

The class did represent the majority of the time with 45% of the class voting reservationist. I think there are both similarities, and differences, between Wilson’s policies and foreign policy of today; one difference was highlighted well by a historian stating that President Bush’s foreign policy tried to, “organize the world in a unipolar way” while Wilsonian policy looked at, “building a cooperative international order” (2:00, Comparing Wilson and Bush video). One similarity, also talked about in that video, was that Bush was struck by the complexities of trying to change society. Wilson was also struck by those difficulties.

Part 3:

All and all, I like the idea of non-intervention vs. isolationism. I think what Ron Paul says is very closely related to Henry Cabot Lodge; neither person is against intermingling with other nations for positive reasons, but they are against intervening in foreign affairs. I think that is close to how President Trump’s stance is described in the article. I think what these folks are saying is that, in our current political climate, it is impossible for the U.S. to be completely removed, but we have gotten to a place of over-involvement.

Sum of ratings:[1](#) (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Reservationist or Isolationist

by [Maximillian Prentice](#) - Saturday, April 27, 2019, 10:28 PM

I just wanted to wrap-up/ add on to my post a little bit. I have been thinking about my standing on U.S. foreign policy and I think I most closely relate to Ron Paul. I also think he is a good representative of the "ideals <----> reality" spectrum in the United States; someone like Alan Keyes could represent ideals while Ron Paul would represent reality. Ron Paul talks about the cost and "unintended consequences" of foreign intervention (0:45, Paul Interview). Alan Keyes is passionate about U.S. intervention, and makes some great points about the United States being, "a nation of nations, a people of many peoples. We are in touch with every peoples on the face of the Earth" (0:47; Keyes video). While I understand where he is coming from, I still fee like it is not the United States' job to police the world. It is also interesting to note that Paul and Keyes are both republicans; John McCain was also a republican and disagreed with Ron Paul. People think that we should be involved in other countries, but it might be better to focus more at home. But that is just my opinion and I feel like we are moving farther away from that.

Sum of ratings:[1](#) (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Comparing past with present

by [Aaron Richards](#) - Saturday, April 27, 2019, 9:33 PM

Woodrow Wilson is famous for his 14 point plan and want for a league of nations. However congress prevented his dream by not ratifying the Treaty of Versailles. I was listening to NPR the other day and they were discussing how Trump was pulling the US from the UN Arms Trade Treaty which was signed by Obama and still hasn't been ratified. (<https://www.npr.org/2019/04/26/717547741/trump-moves-to-withdraw-u-s-from-u-n-arms-trade-treaty>) Both presidents being democrats and having a republican controlled congress shows some clear parallels. Since WWI the US has gotten more involved in international affairs and recently with Trump we've been drifting back to isolationism.

Sum of ratings:[2](#) (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Poll

by [Kaleah Holmes](#) - Saturday, April 27, 2019, 9:51 PM

Most of this class is on the Internationalist side of the spectrum (found on the [Foreign Policy Opinion Poll](#)). I think it is interesting that the majority wants America to be very involved in the world. This poll's results are the opposite of the results in 1918. I guess America is more social now than it was previously. I would prefer if we take a step back from other countries and focus on home, still helping other countries if they absolutely need it, but only then. I do not think it is the USA's job or responsibility to protect and maintain the rest of the world. When we interfere with other places and their business it makes them angry at us. This is not good. It is like we are politely (or forcefully I don't know) walking around asking if somebody wants to fight. Getting involved can get messy.

Sum of ratings:[0](#) (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: Poll

by [Kaleah Holmes](#) - Saturday, April 27, 2019, 10:31 PM

President Wilson would have been much more accepted today than he was in his time. I know this because of the [Foreign Policy Opinion Poll](#) (see in moodle). The majority of the class voted that they were Internationalists. President Wilson was also an Internationalist. That is not the only thing linking President Wilson to recent times. Apparently President Obama felt he needed more power, and that the Republican congress had too much power (Mitch McConnell video). These are distinct personality traits. This also backs up what Professor Escobar said during class "Wilson had a Jesus complex". Both of these democratic presidents are internationalists. This also shows that Wilson would have been more accepted today. Like I said in my post before, America is more social now, this country wants to be involved. The majority of us want to check up on everybody. I think today we would have praised Wilson's ideas on getting our country out in the world, socializing us more. We would have either praised him or do what Mitch McConnell did, and criticize him. I think Wilson's ideas are nice in theory but I would still rather us keep to ourselves more.

Sum of ratings:[1](#) (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Part 3
by [Aaron Richards](#) - Saturday, April 27, 2019, 10:03 PM

When watching these videos I agreed with a fair number of Ron Paul's points. We have military base all over the world and yet there aren't any foreign bases here at home. So why are we spread out so far and imposing our rule on sovereign nations that are not a part of our government? It is not stated in our constitution the right to station troops in other countries outside of war. We act like the worlds police and yet have trouble policing ourselves with illegal immigration, violence, police malpractice, and not being able to care for our own citizens.

Sum of ratings:[0 \(1\)](#)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



my 2 cents.
by [David Galbreath](#) - Saturday, April 27, 2019, 10:22 PM

Is it right to force people to conform to our beliefs? I don't think so. Is it right to police for countries that have conflicts with neighboring countries? not in my opinion and here's why.

I once was told that the art of sophistication is to use the least amount of force to possible to achieve the desired outcome. so with this in mind, I feel that reasons to interfere are limited. Why force a country to be more like us if all that would do is diminish the authenticity of their culture. people should be left alone.

The more I learn about Wilson the more I think; he started with a well-intended idea that turned into the manipulation of less powerful people. force should only be used as last resort. It's 2019 if we can't get along leave them alone.

lastly, I wonder what Mitch McConnell would say about Trump's overreach as president. If he was so critical of Obama creating a too powerful executive branch, what does he think Trump's attempts to grant himself emergency presidential powers?

To step into any countries conflicts is to say "we know what is right and wrong, and currently, you're doing it wrong." Its rude annoying rampant nationalism that costs the taxpayers' money and the soldiers' lives.

Sum of ratings:[1 \(1\)](#)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

◀ [Taxation](#)

[The Role of the U.S. in the World](#) ▶

◀ [Web Video - Wilson at Versailles](#)

[CLICK HERE](#) for Forum 2 Materials & Questions ▶

Moodle Docs for this page

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Log out)
HST 203 Sp19 (Escobar Meta 44706 47037)
Get the mobile app